arXiv:cond-mat/9403054v1 15 Mar 1994

Aspect of Spin-Charge Separation due to Antiferromagentic Spin Fluctuations in Technically Nested 2D Metals

Kazumasa MIYAKE and Osamu NARIKIYO

Department of Material Physics, Faculty of Engineering Science

Osaka University, Toyonaka 560, Japan

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

It is shown that the charge susceptibility in nearly half-filled two-dimensional (2D) metals, with technically nested Fermi surface, shows anomaly at the wavevector different from that for the spin susceptibility at low temperatures. Namely charge degrees of freedom behave there as if their "Fermi surface" corresponded to that of "holes" created in the Mott insulator. Such anomaly is caused by the Aslamazov-Larkin type contribution of 2D antiferromagnetic spin fluctuations. This phenomenon gives a possible clue to resolve the paradox of normal state properties of high-T_c cuprates *starting* from the Fermi-liquid fixed point.

Typeset using REVTEX

Since the discovery of high-T_c cuprates, it has been a central issue how to understand the anomalous properties in the normal state [1,2]. Among them the most exotic one is that the charge degrees of freedom behave as if they were "holes" created in the Mott insulator by doping while the spin degrees of freedom show a response reflecting the existence of large Fermi surface consistent with the Luttinger sum rule [3]. This observation seemed to promote theories which rely on the idea of spin-charge separation in one form or another [1,3–8]. Indeed, such theories well explain a considerable part of anomalous properties. Furthermore, it has recently been shown by high temperature expansion [9] that the equal time charge correlation function of 2D t-J model has a characteristic wavevector corresponding to the Fermi wavevector of spinless version of the model suggesting the spin-charge separation to occur in the low temperature limit. However, it is still uncertain whether the spin-charge separation can be shown explicitly by reliable calculations, and some key experiments, such as a systematics of anomalous behavior of Hall constant [10,11], remain to be unexplained.

On the other hand, the Fermi-liquid theory [12] in its simple form fails immediately to explain such anomalies, because the spin and the charge degrees of freedom are confined there no matter how the electron correlation is strong as in the heavy fermion systems. However, some part of anomalies, such as a gross feature of temperature dependence of the resistivity and the longitudinal NMR relaxation rate, can be explained by taking into account the spin-fluctuation effect starting from the Fermi-liquid theory [13,14]. Indeed, in order to understand such anomalies, it seems still useful to extend the concept of "adiabatic continuation" [12,15] for the Fermi-liquid description and to take into account the perturbations around the Fermi-liquid fixed point. Nevertheless, the apparent spin-charge separation aspect observed in the Hall effect has remained a longstanding unsolved paradox from this point of view.

Recently, we have found [16] that overall feature of the anomaly concerning the Hall constant can be understood by taking the effect of antiferromagnetic spin fluctuations of 2D metals with technically nested Fermi surface into account on the basis of the Fermi-liquid description. An Aslamazov-Larkin (AL) type contribution [17] of spin fluctuations plays

a crucial role there. A purpose of this paper is to discuss the physical meaning of such a contribution by showing that the charge susceptibility around the Γ-point obtains the singular behavior *as the temperature is decreased*. The characteristic wavevectors are given by difference of incommensurate wavevectors $\mathbf{Q}_i^*$ (i=1∼4) of dominant spin fluctuations, because two modes of spin fluctuations with $\mathbf{Q} \sim \mathbf{Q}^*$ give rise to the singularity at $(\mathbf{Q}_i^* - \mathbf{Q}_j^*)$ which are all located around the Γ-point. Namely, spin and charge degrees of freedom have different characteristic wavevector, or an aspect of spin-charge separation emerges, as an effect of mode-coupling between the spin and the charge fluctuations.

It has been shown, in course of microscopic justification of the self-consistent renormalization (SCR) theory of metallic magnetism [18,19], that the charge susceptibility is also subject to a passive influence of spin fluctuations. Namely, the Feynman diagram shown in Fig. 1 gives the most singular contribution to the charge susceptibility. Since it is the property of spin fluctuations that attracted attentions there, an importance of this AL-type process seems to have been unrecognized. The analytic expression $\kappa^{\rm AL}(\mathbf{q})$ for this diagram is given by

$$\kappa^{\rm AL}(\mathbf{q}) = 3T \sum_{\omega_m} \sum_{\mathbf{Q}} [\gamma_3(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{Q}; i\omega_m)]^2 \chi(\mathbf{Q}, i\omega_m) \chi(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{q}, i\omega_m) + \kappa_{\rm inc}^{\rm AL}, \tag{1}$$

where $\kappa_{\rm inc}^{\rm AL}$ denotes an incoherent part of AL contribution which is expected to be non-singular, $\chi(\mathbf{Q}, i\omega_m)$ denotes a coherent part of the spin-fluctuation propagator, and γ_3 is the mode-coupling vertex made of three fermions loop:

$$\gamma_3(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{Q}; i\omega_m) = 3T \sum_{\epsilon_n} \sum_{\mathbf{p}} I^2 G(\mathbf{p}, i\epsilon_n) G(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}, i\epsilon_n) G(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{Q}, i\epsilon_n + i\omega_m). \tag{2}$$

The numerical factor 3 in eqs. (1) and (2) arises from taking trace on spin variables. Here we have followed the notation of the Hubbard model for simplicity so that I in eq. (2) denotes the *renormalized* on-site repulsion. However, essentially the same expressions as eqs. (1) and (2) are obtained even if we started from the itinerant-localized duality model [20] which takes into account key characteristic of strongly correlated metals, regardless of one-band or multiband model. The Green function G's in eq. (2) denotes that of coherent part describing the quasiparticles.

The spin-fluctuation propagator $\chi(\mathbf{Q}, i\omega_m)$ is determined so as to satisfy a *self-consistent* equation of the mode-coupling scheme as in Ref. [19]. A difference from the usual case [13,19] arises if the Fermi surface of quasiparticles is nested, perfectly or technically. Such a case has been discussed already in three dimensions [21], where the spin-density-wave long range order always sets in as temperature is decreased. We have recently extended it to 2D case and obtained $\chi(\mathbf{Q}, i\omega_m)$ near the incommensurate antiferromagnetic wavevector $\mathbf{Q}_i^*$ in the form [21,22]

$$\chi(\mathbf{Q}, i\omega_m) = \sum_i \frac{N_{\rm F}}{\eta + A(\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{Q}_i^*)^2 + C|\omega_m|}, \tag{3}$$

where $N_{\rm F}$ is the renormalized density of states per spin at the Fermi level, and A and C would be estimated as $A/IN_{\rm F} \approx 7\zeta(3)/32\pi^2 \cdot v_{\rm F}^2/T^2$, $v_{\rm F}$ being the renormalized Fermi velocity, and $C/IN_{\rm F} \approx \pi/8T$ if the circular band were assumed. Crudely speaking, η in eq. (3) shows the temperature dependence like

$$\eta \approx (T + \Theta)/\epsilon_{\rm F}, \tag{4}$$

where $\epsilon_{\rm F}$ is the renormalized Fermi energy, and Θ the "Curie-Weiss temperature" parametrizing an extent of deviation from antiferromagnetic phase boundary. Deviations from the behavior given by eq. (4) occur both at $T < \Theta$ and $T > T^*$, T^* being the characteristic temperature where the character of spin fluctuations crosses over from itinerant to localized one as discussed elsewhere [22].

Since the dominant contribution of $\kappa^{\rm AL}(\mathbf{q})$, eq. (1), arises from the terms with ω_m=0 and $\mathbf{Q} \sim \mathbf{Q}_i^*$, it is estimated as

$$\kappa^{\rm AL}(\mathbf{q}) = 3\sum_{i,j} \gamma_3(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{Q}_i^*; 0)\gamma_3(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{Q}_j^*; 0) T\sum_{\mathbf{Q}} \frac{N_{\rm F}}{\eta + A(\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{Q}_i^*)^2} \frac{N_{\rm F}}{\eta + A(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{Q}_j^*)^2}. \tag{5}$$

Thus $\kappa^{\rm AL}(\mathbf{q})$ is expected to have many peaks at $\mathbf{q} = 0, \pm(\mathbf{Q}_1^* - \mathbf{Q}_2^*),\ \pm(\mathbf{Q}_1^* - \mathbf{Q}_3^*),\ \pm(\mathbf{Q}_1^* - \mathbf{Q}_4^*)$, where the positions of two peaks of $\chi(\mathbf{Q}, 0)$ in eq. (5) coincide each other. The loci of $\kappa^{\rm AL}(\mathbf{q})$'s extreme in $\mathbf{q}$-space are shown in Fig. 2 together with those of $\mathbf{Q}^*$'s. The maximum value of $\kappa^{\rm AL}(\mathbf{q})$ is reached at $\mathbf{q} = 0$:

$$\kappa^{\rm AL}(0) = 3 \times 4[\gamma_3(0,\mathbf{Q}^*;0)]^2 T \sum_{\mathbf{Q}} \frac{N_{\rm F}^2}{(\eta + AQ^2)^2} \tag{6}$$

$$\approx 3\frac{[\gamma_3(0,\mathbf{Q}^*;0)]^2}{\pi A} \cdot \frac{T}{\eta} \cdot N_{\rm F}^2. \tag{7}$$

Here we have left the most singular contribution of $\mathbf{Q}$-summation in eq. (6). The factor 4 in eq. (6) represents number of independent $\mathbf{Q}^*$ shown in Fig. 2.

The factors $\gamma_3(0,\mathbf{Q}^*;0)$, eq. (2), and A in eq. (7) are numerically calculated with use of a model dispersion $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ of renormalized quasiparticles which has been used to analyze the neutron scattering experiments of cuprates [7]:

$$\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = -2t(\cos k_x a + \cos k_y a) - 4t' \cos k_x a \cos k_y a - 2t''(\cos 2k_x a + \cos 2k_y a). \tag{8}$$

After the summation of ϵ_n is performed in eq. (2), $\gamma_3(0,\mathbf{Q}^*;0)$ is expressed as follows:

$$\frac{\gamma_3(0,\mathbf{Q}^*;0)}{I^2} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{1}{(\xi_{\mathbf{p}} - \xi_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{Q}^*})}\Big[\frac{{\rm th}\frac{\xi_{\mathbf{p}}}{2T} - {\rm th}\frac{\xi_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{Q}^*}}{2T}}{(\xi_{\mathbf{p}} - \xi_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{Q}^*})} - \frac{1}{2T}{\rm ch}^{-2}\frac{\xi_{\mathbf{p}}}{2T}\Big], \tag{9}$$

where $\xi_{\mathbf{p}} \equiv \varepsilon_{\mathbf{p}} - \mu$. Analytic expression of A in eq. (3) is given by expanding the polarization function with respect to wavevector around $\mathbf{Q}^*$ as follows:

$$\Pi(\mathbf{Q}^* + \mathbf{q}, 0) = -T\sum_{\epsilon_n}\sum_{\mathbf{p}} G(\mathbf{p}, i\epsilon_n) G(\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{Q}^* + \mathbf{q}, i\epsilon_n)$$

$$\approx \Pi(\mathbf{Q}^*, 0) - \frac{A}{I}\mathbf{q}^2 + \cdots. \tag{10}$$

Thus, explicit form of A is given by

$$\frac{A}{I} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mathbf{p}}\Big\{\frac{1}{(\xi_{\mathbf{p}} - \xi_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{Q}^*})^2}\Big[\frac{{\rm th}\frac{\xi_{\mathbf{p}}}{2T} - {\rm th}\frac{\xi_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{Q}^*}}{2T}}{(\xi_{\mathbf{p}} - \xi_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{Q}^*})} - \frac{1}{2T}{\rm ch}^{-2}\frac{\xi_{\mathbf{p}}}{2T}\Big]\Big[v_x^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\xi_{\mathbf{p}} - \xi_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{Q}^*})\frac{\partial v_x}{\partial p_x}\Big]$$

$$-\frac{1}{4T^2}\frac{1}{(\xi_{\mathbf{p}} - \xi_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{Q}^*})}{\rm ch}^{-2}\frac{\xi_{\mathbf{p}}}{2T}{\rm th}\frac{\xi_{\mathbf{p}}}{2T}v_x^2\Big\}, \tag{11}$$

where $v_x \equiv \partial\varepsilon/\partial p_x$.

The result for $[\gamma_3(0,\mathbf{Q}^*;0)/I^2]^2/\pi(A/IN_{\rm F})$ is shown in Fig. 3 for parameters, $t'/t = -1/6$ and $t''/t = 0$, reproducing LSCO-type Fermi surface [7], and for the "hole" concentration $\delta =$ 0.05 and 0.10. The energy scale adopted here is $4t$, half of the renormalized bandwidth. It is

easily seen that asymptotic behavior in high temperature region of $\gamma_3(0,\mathbf{Q}^*;0)/I^2$, eq. (9), and A/I, eq. (11), are both proportional to $1/T^2$, and so is that of $[\gamma_3(0,\mathbf{Q}^*;0)/I^2]^2/\pi(A/I)$, while the asymptotic behavior of A/I is not attained yet around $T/\epsilon_{\rm F}\sim 0.1$. The maximum values of $[\gamma_3(0,\mathbf{Q}^*;0)/I^2]^2/\pi(A/I)$ reach (2∼3) depending on δ, and so do those of $\kappa^{\rm AL}(0)/N_{\rm F}$ because other factors included in eq. (7) are $T/\eta\sim 1$, $I\sim 1$, and $N_{\rm F}\sim 1$. Therefore the singular contribution $\kappa^{\rm AL}(0)$, eq. (7), dominates over the normal part of charge susceptibility $\kappa^{\rm N}(0)\sim 2N_{\rm F}$. It is remarked that the maximum of $[\gamma_3(0,\mathbf{Q}^*;0)/I^2]^2/\pi(A/I)$ for δ=0.05 is larger than that for δ=0.10. The reason why the temperature giving the maximum for δ=0.05 is shifted to higher temperature is probably due to simple use of a rigid band picuture for the dispersion (8). It is expected that a real shape of the fully renormalized Fermi surface approaches the perfect nesting form as the half-filling is approached, so that the energy scale h characterizing deviation from perfect nesting decreases making the high temperature asymptotic behavior survive down to h. Conversely, if there were no nesting such anomaly of $\kappa^{\rm AL}$ would fade away at low temperatures.

Other extreme of $\kappa^{\rm AL}(\mathbf{q})$, the loci of which are located on the ridge surrounding the Γ-point, are smaller than $\kappa^{\rm AL}(0)$ for geometrical reasons. The characteristic wavevector of such extreme is related with deviation of the incommensurate wavevector $\mathbf{Q}^*$'s from commensurate one $\mathbf{Q}_0\equiv(\pi/a,\pi/a)$, and is expected to vanish as $\delta\to 0$. This is parallel to the finding of Puttika *et al* [9] although the details are somewhat different. The present anomaly can be regarded as $4k_{\rm F}$ singularity, suggested by Fukuyama *et al.* in Ref. [3], which is triggered here by two modes of spin fluctuations with $2k_{\rm F}$ singularity. This aspect of spin-charge separation is also consistent with the recent result of Monte Carlo study for the ground state of 2D Hubbard model by Furukawa and Imada [23] showing that the charge susceptibility diverges even in *intermediate* coupling region (U=4t) as $\kappa(0)\propto\delta^{-1}$ while the *uniform* spin susceptibility $\chi(0)$ shows no anomaly at all. It should be remarked that the dynamical mass enhancement caluculated by the Gutzwiller treatment is negligible for the coupling U/t=4, i.e., $m^*/m=(1-\partial\Sigma(\epsilon)/\partial\epsilon)\sim 1$ in the Fermi-liquid sense.

The most divergent corrections to $\kappa^{\rm AL}(0)$ are such as those shown in Fig. 4. These are

arranged in the geometric series, so that $\kappa^{\rm AL}(0)$ is replaced as

$$\kappa^{\rm AL}(0) \to \kappa^{\rm AL}(0)\Big[1+\frac{\gamma_4}{4\pi A}\cdot\frac{T}{\eta}\Big]^{-1}, \tag{12}$$

where γ_4 is low energy limit of the square vertex, the mode-coupling constant of spin fluctuations $\chi(\mathbf{Q}^*)$'s. High temperature asymptotic behavior of γ_4 is given as $\gamma_4 \approx 7\zeta(3)N_{\rm F}/8\pi^2T^2$, the same as that of A, for the circular band. Therefore, the singularity of the right hand side in the low temperature region is expected to remain the same as $\kappa^{\rm AL}(0)$.

It is noted that a possible van Hove singularity in the polarization function $\Pi(0,0)$, eq. (10), is easily suppressed by taking only RPA diagrams into account: $\kappa^{\rm RPA}(0) = 2\Pi(0,0)/[1+I\Pi(0,0)]$.

In 3D case, the present anomaly for $\kappa^{\rm AL}$ is weakened considerably because of phase space reason. Indeed, $\mathbf{Q}$-summation in eq. (6) results in a factor $A^{-3/2}\cdot\ln(1/\eta)$ instead of $A^{-1}\cdot\eta^{-1}$ leaving a weak singularity as $\kappa^{\rm AL}(0)\sim\ln(1/\eta)$. Here we have used the fact that the singularity of $\gamma_3(0,\mathbf{Q}^*;0)/I^2$ and A/I are both $1/T^2$ the same as in 2D.

In conclusion, it has been shown that the charge susceptibility in nearly half-filled 2D metals has pronounced singularity as decreasing temperature at the wavevector corresponding to two modes of spin fluctuations if the Fermi surface is technically nested. As a result the charge degrees of freedom show response in the low temperature region as if the "Fermi surface" were for the "holes" created in the Mott insulator. Such anomaly is caused by the AL-type contribution of 2D antiferromagnetic spin fluctuations. This phenomenon gives a possible clue to resolve the paradox of normal state properties of high-$T_{\rm c}$ cuprates *starting* from the Fermi-liquid fixed point.

One of us (K. M.) acknowledges N. Nagaosa for conversation reminding him of an intimate relation of the present work to that of Ref. [23]. This work is supported by the Grant-in-Aid for General Scientific Research (04640369), and Monbusho International Scientific Program, Joint Research "Magnetism and Superconductivity in Highly Correlated Systems" (03044037), and the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Priority Areas "Science of High Temperature Superconductivity" (04240103) of Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.

REFERENCES

[1] P. W. Anderson, Sience **235** (1987) 1526; in *Frontiers and Borderlines in Many-Particle Physics, International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi", Course CIV*, ed. by R. A. Broglia and J. R. Schrieffer (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987), p. 1; Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **107** (1992) 91.

[2] C. M. Varma, P. B. Littlewood, S. Schmitt-Rink, E. Abrahams and A. E. Ruckenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63** (1989) 1996; C. M. Varma and T. Giamarchi, in *Strongly Interacting Fermions and High-T_c Superconductivity, Ecole de Physique Théorique (Les Houches, 1991)*, (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992).

[3] See, for example, H. Fukuyama and Y. Hasegawa, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. Superconducting Materials (1988) p. 205.; Y. Suzumura, Y. Hasegawa and H. Fukuyama, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **57** (1988) 2768.

[4] F. C. Zhang and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **37** (1988) 3759.

[5] N. Nagaosa and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 2450; Phys. Rev. B **43** (1991) 1233.

[6] L. B. Ioffe and A. I. Larkin, Phys. Rev. B **39** (1989) 8988; L. B. Ioffe and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. B **42** (1990) 10348.

[7] T. Tanamoto, H. Kohno and H. Fukuyama, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **61** (1992) 1886, and references therein.

[8] M. Imada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **62** (1993) 1105.

[9] W. O. Puttika, R. L. Glenister, R. R. P. Singh and H. Tsunetsugu, preprint (cond-mat 9309031).

[10] T. Nishikawa, J. Takeda and M. Sato, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **62** (1993) 2568; J. Takeda, T. Nishikawa and M. Sato, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **62** (1993) 2571.

[11] H. Y. Hwang, B. Batlogg, H. Takagi, H. L. Kao, J. Kwo, R. J. Cava, J. J. Krajewski and W. F. Peck, jr., preprint.

[12] L. D. Landau, Sov.-Phys. JETP **3** (1957) 920; *ibid* **5** (1957) 101; *ibid* **8** (1959) 70.

[13] T. Moriya, Y. Takahashi and K. Ueda, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 59 (1990) 2905.

[14] H. Kohno and K. Yamada, Prog. Theor. Phys. **85** (1991) 13.

[15] P. W. Anderson, *Basic Notions of Condensed Matter Theory*, (Benjamin, New York, 1984), chap. 3.

[16] K. Miyake and O. Narikiyo, unpublished.

[17] L. G. Aslamazov and A. I. Larkin, Sov.-Phys. JETP **10** (1968) 875.

[18] A. Kawabata, J. Phys. F **4** (1974) 1477.

[19] T. Moriya, *Spin Fluctuations in Itinerant Electron Magnetism*, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985), chaps 4 and 10, and references therein.

[20] Y. Kuramoto and K. Miyake, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **59** (1990) 2831.

[21] H. Hasegawa, J. Low Temp. Phys. **31** (1978) 475.

[22] K. Miyake and O. Narikiyo, unpublished.

[23] N. Furukawa and M. Imada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **61** (1992) 3331.

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Diagram for the most singular contribution of spin fluctuations to the charge susceptibility $\kappa^{\rm AL}$. Wavy lines denote the spin-fluctuation propagator, eq. (3), and triangle the vertex γ_3, eq. (2).

FIG. 2. (a) Position of incommensurate antiferromagnetic wavevector $\mathbf{Q}^*$ shown by closed circles and wavevectors for the extremes of $\kappa^{\rm AL}$ shown by arrows. (b) Locus of extreme of $\kappa^{\rm AL}(\mathbf{q})$ shown by closed circle the area of which represents a degree of singularity.

FIG. 3. Numerical results of $[\gamma_3(0,\mathbf{Q}^*;0)/I^2]^2/\pi(A/I)$ in eq. (7) for LSCO-type dispersion.

FIG. 4. Series of diagram for the most dominant cerrections to $\kappa^{\rm AL}(0)$.